SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

12th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Vol. XII, Number 15 | P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015 | September 15, 1982

White House Dawdles on Filling Top R&D Posts

The Reagan Administration persists in maintaining a sluggish pace in filling the government's top science-administration jobs.

The latest case involves the Department of Agriculture, where the newly created post of Assistant Secretary for Science and Education has remained vacant since July, when Anson R. Bertrand left to join the Agency for International Development. Bertrand, who held the post under its old title, Director of Science and Education, was long known to be on the way out, but apparently there was no hurry to hire a successor.

The person widely reported to be on the way to the job is Orville Bentley, who has been Dean of the College of Agriculture at the University of Illinois, Urbana, for the past 17 years. But the White House has not yet sent his nomination to the Senate or even announced his selection. An announcement may come soon, SGR has been told, but no one involved with the appointment seemed to know when.

The vacancy does invite attention to the often-employed Reaganite tactic of keeping top posts empty while bureaucratic mayhem is performed at an agency. Ag's Science and Education activities have undergone a lot of slashes from the Carter version. Some 600 jobs have been eliminated and, in particular, nutrition and other consumer-oriented activities have been substantially reduced.

Meanwhile, the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) is plodding along in quest of a new head for the National Science Foundation. That hunt, which has been going since June, when Director John B. Slaughter announced plans to leave January 15 (SGR Vol. XII, No. 11), has not been hobbled by any White House designs for remaking NSF; the Foundation was long ago trimmed and reshaped to suit the Administration's liking.

(Continued on page 2)

Basic Science Squeezed Out On Cancer Advisory Panel

Public discord has broken out on the customarily prim National Cancer Advisory Board, where some current and former members have taken the unprecedented step of openly disapproving of the newest batch of Presidential appointees to the 18-member body.

The Board, the only presidentially appointed scientific council at the National Institutes of Health, is—at least in theory—the ultimate voice on grant applications from cancer researchers and also advises the Director of the National Cancer Institute on priorities for the $1-billion-a-year cancer program.

As of June 2, the Board was coming apart at the seams, however, at least in the opinion of Janet Rowley, Board member and clinical researcher at the University of Chicago School of Medicine. Shortly after that day, when the White House announced six new appointments to fill out the membership, Rowley drafted a letter of protest. After circulating it to the Board

(Continued on page 3)

In Brief

While civilian research agencies have been told to plan for little or no financial growth in coming years, Defense R&D is looking ahead to a steady 10 percent share of a budget that the Reagan Administration has singled out for steady growth through 1988. DoD's Advanced Research Projects Agency, now at $750 million, is budgeted for $864 million next year, according to *Aviation Week,* **and is scheduled to rise to $1.4 billion over the next four years.**

The staff has got so big at the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy that Director George A. Keyworth not only has signed on a Deputy Director but now has acquired an Executive Director—Jerry Jennings, who comes over from the National Security Council, where, among other things, he was concerned with security, as in locked safes. Jennings will also serve as Executive Secretary of the White House Science Council, succeeding Army Colonel Tom Johnson, who has returned to a faculty post at West Point.

OSTP's growth recently drew a reprimand from the House Appropriations Committee, which noted that though only 11 positions are authorized for office, 27 people were on board as of July 19 (SGR Vol. XII, No. 14).

With the receipt of an honorary degree June 12 from Kalamazoo College, the Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, President of Notre Dame University, has surpassed the previous record holder for honorary degrees received—Herbert Hoover, who had 89 of them when he died in 1964.

Academy Gets Fund for Independent Studies

Frank Press, President of the National Academy of Sciences, has announced substantial progress toward a long-cherished goal of the NAS—a bundle of its own to finance studies independent of its now-overwhelming reliance on federal agencies.

Provided by a consortium of private foundations, the sum, $3.7 million for projects over the next three years, may not look like much in the context of a budget that now exceeds $70 million a year—mostly from the government. But that money, as Press suggests in an announcement, can finance a lot of maneuvering room, or as he put it: "In addition to issues of immediate concern to government agencies, we can now examine those problems that do not conveniently fit within an agency's programs, those whose study—if funded entirely by the government—simply would not be credible guides to policy-making."

The foundations involved are the Carnegie Corporation, the Charles E. Culpeper Foundation, the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, and the Rockefeller Foundation. The Alfred P. Sloan Foundation didn't join the group, but provided the Academy with $359,000 for a study of government-university relationships that got underway earlier this year.

Meanwhile, Press, who became President of the Academy in July 1981 after serving as presidential Science Adviser under Jimmy Carter, is also pursuing additional sources of revenue. One possibility that he's exploring calls for industrial firms to contribute to an Academy fund, in return for which they would receive briefings on Academy activities of interest to them. (The Academy does have a substantial kitty of its own, about $30 million in endowment funds. But income from that is said to be stretched thin.)

The newly acquired funds will support several independent studies already underway, plus a series of bilateral arms-control meetings that the Academy has been conducting with a group from the Soviet Academy of Sciences. In addition, according to an Academy announcement, two new studies are planned, one on the implications of the aging of the American population; the second, says the Academy, "will synthesize currently available scientific information on the emissions, fates, and effects of atmospheric acids and other hazardous pollutants." The latter is a politically sensitive subject that the Academy once had under study for the Environmental Protection Agency; the job was later shifted to the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy amid reports that the Reagan Administration was displeased with findings that suggested that acid rain might, after all, be of industrial origin.

NSF POST *(Continued from page 1)*

Rather, the delay seems to arise from a leisurely spirit of pursuit combined with a diminished attractiveness of the job. In bygone days, when research budgets were growing and the White House took pride in boosting science, the NSF directorship was a lustrous post on the American scientific landscape. Even Richard Nixon, after trying to tinker with it politically, backed away, apologized, and said he'd never do it again.

But with NSF now consigned by the Administration to negligible budget increases, and its much-needed school-level science programs arbitrarily cancelled by the Office of Management and Budget, a lot of the glory is gone from the job of Director of the National Science Foundation.

OSTP does remain confident that a successor will be in place before Slaughter leaves in January to become Chancellor of the College Park campus of the University of Maryland, and that there will be no repetition of the 10-month delay that preceded the appointment of James Wyngaarden as Director of the National Institutes of Health last spring. A big hitch, SGR is advised, is the laborious process of checking recruits who seem suitable for presidential appointments. Given the grief that the Administration is now reaping from the marathon investigation of Labor Secretary Ray Donovan's pre-appointment activities, it may be assumed that additional care is going into pre-nomination checks.

©Science & Government Report, Inc., 1982

ISSN 0048-9581

Editor and Publisher **Daniel S. Greenberg**

Associate Publisher **Wanda J. Reif**

Circulation Manager **Diane Kupelian**

Contributing Correspondents

Christopher Joyce, Kim A. McDonald (Washington); Francois Seguier (Paris); Ros Herman (London)

Independently published by *Science & Government Report,* Inc., twice monthly, except in January, June & July. Annual subscription: Institutions, $132.50 (two years, $235.00). Information about bulk and individual rates upon request. Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second-class postage at Washington, DC. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six months of publication date.

...Basic Scientists: Last One May Soon Leave

(Continued from page 1)

members, she came up with seven signatures in support of her contention that the new appointments put the Board's balance of basic and clinical science and lay opinion seriously out of kilter. Since the appointments had already been made, there was nothing that could be done, except to ask the medical and scientific community at large to rouse their professional societies and protest to the White House.

So Rowley sent a letter to *Science*, the journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, where it was printed August 13. In the letter, Rowley observed that the Board had previously included six basic scientists, six clinical scientists, and six lay members. "We are concerned," the letter stated, "because, at present, there is only one basic scientist on the Board. Four basic scientists...and two lay members left the Board in June 1982; none of the new appointees is a basic scientist. Only one member of the current Board has a PhD or an MD/PhD degree. Of the new members, none has been a member of a National Institutes of Health study section or has ever had an RO1 grant from the National Cancer Institute, and only one has ever served on an NIH council." (Study sections are the first line of review for research grant applicants. An RO1 grant is a standard grant for a research project.)

Because of these shortcomings, the letter contended, the current Board doesn't have the appropriate research credentials to assess the work of the study sections, its first responsibility, or to act on appeals from scientists who are turned down by the study sections.

"We believe that the scientific community should be aware of these changes in the composition of the Board," the letter stated, "because they will have a direct and deleterious effect on American scientific programs that are supported by the National Cancer Institute."

Harsh words, especially for the six signatories who remain on the Board and who must live with the new batch of appointees. The new members who have drawn the attention are Tim Lee Carter, MD, former Congressman who has been designated the new Chairman; Richard Block, of the H. and R. Block tax-preparation chain; Angel Bradley, identified as a "homemaker"; Victor Braren, MD, Professor of urology and Assistant Professor of pediatrics at Vanderbilt University; Edward Calhoon, MD, a practicing physician from Oklahoma, and Professor Geza Jako, MD, surgeon and Professor at Boston University School of Medicine.

While the new Board is replete with physicians, said Rowley, none of the new members is a basic scientist. That limits their ability to assess research in biochemistry, immunology, molecular biology, and fundamental genetics, she added. This drift away from basic science began before the Reagan appointments, Rowley observed. "So one could say it's political change, (but) not restricted to any political administration."

To make matters worse, the one remaining "basic" scientist, Gerald Wogan, of MIT, is said to be retiring soon—and then there will be none. Retiring Board Chairman Henry Pitot, of the McArdle Laboratory for Cancer Research at the University of Wisconsin, also lent his name to the letter. He noted that "There is much concern whether the Board is going to serve just a political function rather than a scientific one." Pitot says the White House got plenty of "good names" of basic scientists, but preferred its own agenda. "This could have a profound effect on the course of basic research in oncology," he predicts.

Four of the six members who left the Board this summer apparently fit the definition of "basic" scientist: Bruce Ames, pioneer in oncology at UC Berkeley; Harold Amos, a molecular geneticist at Harvard; Philippe Shubik, an oncological researcher now at Oxford University in England, and Pitot.

The sense of disappointment runs even deeper with some of the current lay members of the Board. Sheldon Samuels, of the Industrial Union Department of the AFL-CIO and a signatory to the letter, marks up the new lot to "insensitivity of the government" and akin to the appointment of a political overseer to keep the Board tethered. Lay member Rose Kushner, Director of the Breast Cancer Advisory Center in Maryland, laments, "I think it is unfortunate if scientists are picked for their political persuasion."

To this unusual show of outspoken criticism, the official NCI reply is that "The NCI staff is pleased with the composition of the Board." NCI added that "it has lots of experts outside the Board" to help evaluate the merits of the National Cancer Program.

By NCI's reckoning, the new Board has 11 MDs, one PhD, one lawyer, two bachelors of science and three "other." Prior to the June appointments, the Board looked like this: seven MDs, four PhDs, one lawyer, one bachelor of science, three "other," and two MD/PhDs.

NCI spokeswoman Linda Anderson observed that the National Cancer Act of 1971 set a maximum of 12 physicians and eight lay members for the Board. But when the act was amended in 1978, that prescription was changed to require that not less than five of those shall be knowledgeable in environmental carcinogenesis, including occupational and dietary disease. In addition, at least two of the MDs must have been involved

(Continued on page 4)

NIH Head Questions Grant Funds for Salaries

Excerpts of interest from around the Washington speech circuit—in this case, a symposium on Academic Science and the Federal Government in the 1980s, August 26, at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association:

●

James B. Wyngaarden, Director of the National Institutes of Health: The development of the NIH budget for 1983 provides an illustration of the fiscal dynamics and dilemmas of the early '80s. In order to make more funds available for the support of new research, the NIH has proposed among other adjustments a plan to fund indirect costs on all grants at only 90 percent of the negotiated rate. This proposal now constitutes a part of the President's budget for NIH for FY 1983 which is presently before the Congress. Although greeted generally with applause from scientists, this proposal has engendered a concerted, vigorous and uniformly negative response from administrators of grantee institutions who look upon it as an arbitrary and unilateral abrogation of established principles. The loss of indirect expense funds exacerbates the financial distress that already besets many of our academic partners.

In our on-going discussions on this matter, we do not dispute the fact that indirect costs are real. We are concerned, however, that there has been a steady increase in indirect expenses of research from about 15 percent of the total research award in 1966 to the current 29.5 percent. At issue is the extent of cost sharing of the overhead of research by the university in return for the general strengthening of the university through the research support received from the Government.

The NIH did not intend this 10 percent reduction in funding of indirect costs as a permanent measure. It was proposed in order to distribute budgetary restraints across both research and overhead activities during FY '83 and as a signal that indirect costs funded by the Government needed to be contained and perhaps reassessed as to their appropriateness as a charge to the Government....

Another issue that concerns me is the extent to which faculty salaries consume the research dollar. When Vannevar Bush and his colleagues charted the Federal entry into research collaboration with academia, they emphasized the importance of the intact institution serving the traditional goals of a university. They could foresee the pressures of divided loyalty experienced by a research investigator whose base is in a university but whose support is Federal funds. Today's pattern of faculty support from Federal granting agencies evolved in steps: First, there was the summer salary for the faculty member who was on a regular nine-month appointment; then came reimbursement for released time so that the institution could "fill in" for the investigator who was working on a research project; and finally came full reimbursement to the faculty member for all time spent in research activities. The extensive use of grant funds for the salary support of tenured faculty seems to carry the implication that research is an extraneous activity rather than a part of the fabric of the academic life. We will be exploring alternative mechanisms of faculty support through the university that might strengthen rather than weaken institutional loyalties....

Frank Press, President of the National Academy of Sciences: Certainly, the events of the past few years have revealed serious weaknesses in perceptions of the value of the social and behavioral sciences by those who must make decisions. You can, if you wish, blame ideological attacks for your recent problems; as a retaliation for MACOS [an NSF-supported social-science curriculum project] and that sort of thing. That, I think, is too simplistic; it assumes that people now understand better; that the future leaders will be kinder. Perhaps. But it is a slippery assumption. For evidence of that, you need look no further than Tuesday's *Washington Post*. It reported that in its instructions to agencies and departments for filling out their 1984 budget requests, the Office of Management and Budget asked that they identify requests for social science research and development. The reason given was to avoid duplication....Looking at it with the perspective of someone who spent sometime in government, I can

(Continued on page 5)

CANCER BOARD

(Continued from page 3)

primarily in treating cancer patients. The new Board, she explained, fits those guidelines.

White House science officials are practicing their policy of not commenting on Presidential appointments, although the Office of Science and Technology Policy was prepared with a statement in case someone asked. "The most recent appointments to the Board," says the statement, "includes people whose expertise lies particularly in the application of the results of research to prevention and control of cancer." The Board, OSTP said, is a "policy body" whose job is not as a "primary technical review panel"; that job lies with the NIH review panels and other outside sources. An OSTP spokesman said there has not been a noticeable number of letters coming into OSTP or the White House in response to the letter in *Science*.—CJ

Science Education: NSF Assembles the Data

Crammed with more detail than any previous publication of its kind, a newly issued government report, *Science and Engineering Education: Data and Information,* instantly merits a place as the standard source book in the growing controversy over the condition of those sectors of schooling.

Prepared by the National Science Foundation for the national study being conducted by the Commission on Precollege Education in Mathematics, Science and Technology (SGR) Vol. XII, No. 8), the 215-page report draws upon scattered sources to put together the most detailed statistical portrait available of science and engineering schooling and employment. The only drawback is that some of the numbers are a bit old—dating back to 1976, in some cases, and no more recent than 1980 for most of the data, but that's one of the incurable problems of statistics gathering on the highly fragmented American education scene. Some major points from the report:

• On a national basis, the percentage of "young" doctoral faculty—defined as no more than seven years after the PhD—slumped spectacularly between 1968 and 1980 in every major discipline. In biochemistry, from 31 to 14 percent; physics, from 40 to 11 percent; mathematics, from 52 to 23 percent, and chemistry, from 35 to 16 percent.

• With some 10 percent of engineering faculty positions unfilled—mainly because of the lure of industrial salaries—American engineering schools are heavily dependent on foreign-trained faculty members. In 1979, 32 percent of junior faculty at public four-year

(Continued on page 6)

Entering College Freshmen Probable Choice of Majors

(in percentages)

Subject Areas	1966	1970	1975	1980
Biological sciences	10.9	12.9	17.5	17.8
Business	14.3	16.2	18.9	23.9
Education	10.6	11.6	9.9	7.7
Engineering	9.8	8.6	7.9	11.8
Humanities and Arts	24.3	21.1	12.8	8.9
Mathematics and Statistics	4.5	3.2	1.1	0.6
Physical Science	3.3	2.3	2.7	2.0
Social Sciences	8.2	8.9	6.2	6.7
Other Technical*	2.2	3.7	8.6	8.2
Undecided and Other	11.8	11.6	14.5	12.4
Total Number of Full-Time Freshman (in thousands)	1,163	1,617	1,761	1,712

*Includes computer science; in 1980, 4.9% of entering freshmen indicated a probable major in computer science, data processing, or computer programming.
Source: Astin, A.W., King, M.R., & Richardson, G.T. *The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 1980,* and earlier editions of this report, reprinted in *Science and Engineering Education: Data and Information.*

SOCIAL SCIENCE

(Continued from page 4)

tell you that there is very little explicit recognition by most of the bureaucracy of the way in which your contributions [as social scientists] diffuse our everyday lives. How they are embedded in the information on which decision makers act. Embedded in the very decisions they make....

A difficulty is that the US research support system is biased toward projects, usually of relatively short duration, about two years. And one can in that time do a lot of chemical syntheses, get observation time on a major telescope, target time in an accelerator, or search for specific mammalian genes and study their structure and regulation. That system of research support has, arguably, given American research much of its strength. However, it is often impossible, as many of you know all too painfully, to do behavioral research that is much good in one or two years. The difficulty of launching and maintaining longitudinal research programs illustrates the problem. The results are often shallow analyses and dubious conclusions....

Your difficulties are not only in a lack of adequate recognition of your contributions. They may in part be structural; that is, the lack of any strong focus for the support of the behavioral and social sciences....While there are advantages in multiple funding sources, there are also the problems of duplication, of a lack of coherence in research programs.

Whether it is possible to mitigate those structural difficulties is uncertain. But no matter the support mechanisms, the key point—one that applies to all the sciences—is that this is not the time to cut back in research....

In the Works: Studies Underway at the OSTP

In the Works, SGR's newly launched series on policy-related studies underway in Washington, now takes a look at work in progress at the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) and the White House Science Council, the senior advisory body for the Director of OSTP. They carry a slim portfolio of studies compared to previous administrations'. But the Reagan Administration, often wrong but never in doubt, has little interest in the big scholarly mobilizations that its predecessors frequently commanded for lack of knowing what to do. Our series, which began with a summary of studies underway at the National Academy of Sciences (Vol. XII, No. 13), will appear on an occasional basis. The OSTP and White House Science Council address is: Executive Office Bldg., Washington, DC 20500.

●

The Federal Laboratories Panel. Attached to the White House Science Council, the panel has been working off and on since June to come up with suggestions about the size, scope, and responsibilities of federally owned laboratories. The study is supposed to apply to all the 700 or so labs in the federal inventory, but it's mainly focused on some half-dozen multi-disciplinary centers belonging to the Department of Energy. These labs are also under scrutiny by DOE and Congress, so the Council's panel will not have the field to itself when policymaking time comes. The panel, which expects to wind up its work in April 1983, is chaired by David Packard, Chairman of the Board of Hewlett-Packard; the chief staff person is OSTP's James Ling.

Acid Rain Peer Review Panel. Under OSTP, the panel was appointed in May to assess the state of scientific knowledge concerning the acid-rain problem, which has stirred political enmity between smokestack industries in the midwest and acid-rain recipients in the northeast and Canada. The Administration, with its anti-regulation obsession, has insisted that the acid origins are too poorly understood to warrant action against already slumping industries. The panel, chaired by William A. Nierenberg, Director of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, has been assigned to study the scientific literature on the subject and report around the end of this year. Thomas Pestorius, of OSTP, is staffing the study.

Aeronautics Research and Technology Review. An inter-agency study, headed by OSTP, the review is examining the condition of aeronautics research and whether the US aircraft industry can carry on effectively if the Reagan Administration continues to cut federal spending in this area. The study began in March and is scheduled for completion next month. The inter-agency group is chaired by Victor Reis, of the OSTP staff; the chief staff person is Louis Montulli, whom OSTP borrowed from the Air Force.

(Continued on page 7)

NY Times *Behavioral-Science Writer*

Bryce Nelson, a reporter in the Washington bureau of the *Los Angeles Times,* will join the science-news staff of the *New York Times* in mid-October to cover the behavioral sciences. Nelson formerly was on the News and Comment staff of *Science* magazine. In his new position, he will be based in New York.

EDUCATION

(Continued from page 5)

engineering colleges had obtained their bachelor degrees outside the US; for comparable private institutions, the figure was 23.5 percent. In the top 50 engineering schools—as measured by engineering research and development expenditures—22 percent of junior faculty had trained abroad.

• Mathematics ranked at the top in a Gallup survey of subjects deemed "essential" by the general public for high school students—with 97 percent of respondents placing it in that category; science got 83 percent, coming in fifth, behind English grammar and composition, civics and government, and US history. Music was rated essential by only 44 percent of those surveyed, foreign language got 43 percent, and art received a 37-percent rating.

• A substantial increase occurred in the employment of science and engineering PhDs from 1973 through 1979. The total, in all fields, rose from 220,410 to 313,736, with over 90 percent employed in science and engineering jobs throughout the period. The biggest sector of employment was educational institutions, which increased from 129,408 to 173,966. Employment by the federal government, however, was fairly sluggish—rising from 18,200 in 1973 to 23,923 in 1979.

• Over the past decade, physics has experienced a sharp decline in the number of PhDs awarded, dropping from 1439 in 1969-70 to 830 in 1979-80. During that period, PhDs awarded in chemistry dropped from 2166 to 1545, while mathematics went from 1236 to 724 and engineering from 3681 to 2507. The only major field that expanded the production of PhDs was the biological sciences—from 3289 in 1969-70 to 3636 in 1979-80.

(Single copies of *Science and Engineering Education: Data and Information,* NSF 82-30, are available without charge from the National Science Foundation, Office of Forms and Publications, Room 235, 1800 G St. Nw., Washington, DC 20550.)

Engineering Academy Sprouts a Second Head

The National Academy of Engineering has finally filled its odd new position of Chairman of the NAE, a post that was created last spring to get around restrictions on industrial influence at the helm of the organization (SGR Vol. XII, No. 9). Into the job, a part-time one, goes Stephen D. Bechtel Jr., chairman of the celebrated company that has given the Reagan Administration its secretaries of Defense and State, plus a Deputy Secretary of the Department of Energy. The Bechtel watchers, a feverish lot in Washington, have taken note.

The job of Chairman was set up when NAE President Courtland D. Perkins, who is of academic origins, was approaching a June retirement date. The elders of the Engineering Academy, who are mainly from industry, wanted one of their own to succeed Perkins. But the parent National Academy of Sciences frowned on that, pointing out that the two academies are heavily involved in studies whose outcomes can have major effects on industry.

With no easy solution in sight, Perkins agreed to delay his retirement for a year and at the same time the Council of the Academy decided to establish a chairmanship of the NAE. According to an announcement, the Chairman will preside over the NAE Council. His post, it says, "complements the position of the President..."

IN THE WORKS *(Continued from page 6)*

Federal Aviation Administration Panel. An offshoot of the White House Science Council, the panel has been assigned to evaluate the FAA's plans for a new national air-traffic control system. Chaired by Paul Gray, President of MIT, the panel is due to report to the Council this week. The chief staff person is Douglas Pewitt, of OSTP.

Panel on Military Technology. Another Council appendage, this panel has been assigned to look into directed-energy weapons, an Air Force favorite that has stirred considerable skepticism in academic physics and among some of the Administration's own senior scientific officials. The study, due for completion this month, is chaired by Edward A. Frieman, former chief of fusion research at Princeton University and head of research at the Department of Energy in the Carter Administration: he's now Executive Vice President of Science Applications, Inc., LaJolla, Calif. The staff man is Alf Andreassen, another detailee from the Air Force.

In previous administrations, studies conducted within the orbit of the White House science office frequently resulted in reports available to the public. Some of these, particularly those issued under the auspices of the now-long-defunct President's Science Advisory Committee, were vigorously touted by the elders of science to get across their views on arms control, federal aid to education, money for science, and so forth.

But things are now different. Whatever papers products emanate from the above-mentioned studies will not be available for the public.

NAS Planning Policy Journal

The founding of a scholarly quarterly journal, tentatively titled *Science and Policy,* has been approved in principle by the Council of the National Academy of Sciences, and indications are said to be favorable for commencing publication in September 1983.

The proposed journal, under close study for about a year, would be under the editorial control of the Academy; production, business affairs, and promotion would be handled by the publishing firm of W.H. Freeman, which has been involved with other Academy publications.

4 Slots Filled on NSF Board

The White House last week announced selections for four of eight vacancies that occurred last May on the 25-member National Science Board, the senior policymaking body for the National Science Foundation. The others will be announced as soon as security checks are completed, according to a staff member at the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), which managed the selection process.

The new appointees and the members they will succeed are:

Charles E. Hess, Dean of the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences and Associate Director of the California Agricultural Experimental Station, UC Davis; replaces William F. Hueg Jr., Professor of Agronomy, University of Minnesota.

John H. Moore, Associate Director and Senior Fellow, the Hoover Institution; replaces Raymond L. Bisplinghoff, Vice President, Tyco Laboratories.

Norman C. Rasmussen, Professor of Nuclear Engineering, MIT; replaces Alexander Rich, Professor of Biophysics, MIT.

Roland W. Schmitt, Vice President of Corporate Research, General Electric; replaces Lloyd M. Cooke, President, National Action Council for Minorities in Engineering.

The Board members whose terms ran out in May have remained on as non-voting consultants. They'll now depart, and the new appointees will be given consultant status pending confirmation by the Senate, which might take some time, given the crowded legislative calendar and the onset of election season.

Defense Science Fund Gets Only Slight Trim

The Administration's plans for enlarging the Defense Department's role in the support of university-based science have suffered relatively little damage in Washington's summerlong budgetary turmoil.

While the final verdict is still to come, in the action so far, a House-Senate appropriations conference snipped only $34 million from the $828-million item that supplies most of the Department's money for academic research. That leaves the amount at $794 million for the fiscal year that starts October 1—an even $100 million above the amount for the current fiscal year.

Of that sum, 44 percent is budgeted for universities; 35 percent for basic research in DoD's inhouse labs, with the balance for industry, non-profits, and federal labs operated by outside contractors. Most of the forthcoming growth is scheduled to go to academic institutions, in accord with the Department's stated aim of restoring the cooperative ties that it long ago enjoyed with academe.

One item that was considered to be in danger for a time has passed safely through the budget gauntlet—DoD's highly prized new program to provide $30 million for new lab equipment in universities.

While the National Science Foundation's quest for a similar special fund was blocked by the Office of Management and Budget, the Defense item remained intact. The long-range aim is to put $30 million a year into the program over a total of five years for "the procurement of research equipment, diagnostic facilities, and instrumentation in the $100,000-$1,000,000 range," according to a Defense Department announcement of the program. The announcement adds that items under $50,000 are considered too small to bother with, while $1 million is the upper range. General-purpose computers are out of the running, but specialized computers "entirely devoted to specific DoD research programs" will be considered—up to a total of $350,000 each. (Deadline for applications: November 30; for further information: Office of Naval Research, Attn: DoD-University Research Instrumentation Program—Code 400 R, 800 North Quincy St., Arlington, Va. 22217.)

The Congressional budget committees were also favorable to a new Navy fellowship program which is now supporting 42 graduate students in physics, electronics, and other disciplines of interest to the Navy. The program is a generous one, providing the students with $12,000 a year for three years and their institutions with $8000 per year.

Hearing Set on R&D Priorities

A hearing tentatively titled, "Setting Priorities for Science," has been scheduled for September 28, 29, and 30 by the House Science and Technology Committee. Witnesses will be from government, universities, and industry, with details on the cast still being worked out.

The hearing will be a joint production of the subcommittees on Science, Research and Technology, chaired by Rep. Doug Walgren (D-Pa.) and Investigations and Oversight, chaired by Rep. Albert Gore (D-Tenn.).

Not likely to be among the witnesses is White House Science Adviser George A. Keyworth, who has politely been griping to his Congressional overseers that his working schedule has at times been wrecked by invitations to the witness chair for casual chats about science policy. Keyworth was before the full Committee in February when it held hearings on "The Science and Technology Budget Under Stress" (soon to be published—copies available without charge from the House Science and Technology Committee, 2321 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC 20515).

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C.

9999
Xerox-University Microfilms
300 N. Zeeb Rd
Ann Arbor MI 48106